



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/364,821	07/30/1999	CHI DARREN	4318	9940

758 7590 12/11/2003

FENWICK & WEST LLP
SILICON VALLEY CENTER
801 CALIFORNIA STREET
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041

EXAMINER

HA, LEYNNA A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2131

DATE MAILED: 12/11/2003

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

2

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/364,821

Applicant(s)

DARREN, CHI

Examiner

LEYNNA T. HA

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 6. 6) ☐ Other: _____

EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT

1. Claims 1-16 have been reexamined and remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

2. **Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chen, Et Al. (US 5,951,698).**

As per claim 1:

Chen, Et Al. teaches a computer-implemented method for detecting a macro virus in code adapted for use on a digital computer, said method comprising the steps of:

analyzing the code to determine whether said code contains instructions causing a macro to be moved to a global environment; **(col.5, lines 3-14 and col.6, lines 38-60)**

when the code contains instructions causing a macro to be moved to a global environment, flagging said macro; **(col.8, lines 30-39 and col.9, lines 43-63)**

analyzing the code to determine whether said code contains instructions causing the flagged macro to be copied to a local document; and **(col.13, line 34 thru col.14, line 23)**

when the code contains instructions causing the flagged macro to be copied to a local document, declaring that said flagged macro contains a macro virus. **(col.15, line 43 thru col.16, line 9)**

As per claim 2:

Chen discloses the macro is contained within a module. **(col.6, lines 31-36)**

As per claim 3:

Chen discloses the code is associated with a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet application. **(col.5, line 22)**

As per claim 4:

Chen discloses the code is written in the Visual Basic language. **(col.5, lines 3-14)**

As per claim 5:

Chen discloses the step of analyzing the code to determine whether said code contains instructions causing a macro to be moved to a global environment comprises determining whether a SaveAs command is present in the code. **(col.14, lines 8-12)**

As per claim 6:

Chen discloses the step of analyzing the code to determine whether said code contains instructions causing the flagged macro to be copied to a local document comprises determining whether a Copy command is present in the code. **(col.14, lines 16-23)**

As per claim 7:

Chen discloses each analyzing step concatenates strings when said analyzing step encounters a concatenation operator within the code. **(col.15, lines 15-41)**

As per claim 8:

Chen discloses each analyzing step makes substitutions for variable names when the code contains variable names that are proxied. **(col.14, lines 5-50)**

As per claim 9:

Chen discloses each analyzing step traces the values of parameter variables when the code contains instructions that are invoked by other code. **(col.14, lines 37-57)**

As per claim 10:

Chen discloses each analyzing step substitutes object names when the code is written in an object oriented programming language and when the code contains substituted object names. **(col.8, lines 2-3)**

As per claim 11:

Chen discloses the step of deleting the macro virus. **(col.11, lines 32-33)**

As per claim 12:

Chen discloses the publicly identified and publicly unidentified macro viruses are detected. **(col.9, lines 34-37)**

As per claim 13:

Chen teaches a method for detecting publicly identified and publicly unidentified macro viruses in code adapted for use on a digital computer, said method comprising the steps of:

analyzing the code to determine whether said code contains instructions causing a macro to be moved to a global environment; **(col.5, lines 3-14 and col.6, lines 38-53)**

when the code does not contain instructions causing a macro to be moved to a global environment, declaring that no macro virus is present;

(col.6, lines 54-63)

when the code contains instructions causing a macro to be moved to a global environment, flagging said macro; **(col.8, lines 30-39 and col.9, lines 43-63)**

analyzing the code to determine whether said code contains instructions causing the flagged macro to be copied to a local document; and **(col.13, line 34 thru col.14, line 23)**

when the code does not contain instructions causing the flagged macro to be copied to a local document,

declaring that no macro virus is present; and **(col.12, lines 35-39)**

when the code contains instructions causing the flagged macro to be copied to a local document, declaring that said flagged macro contains a macro virus. **(col.15, line 43 thru col.16, line 9)**

As per claim 14:

Chen teaches an apparatus for detecting publicly identified and publicly unidentified macro viruses, said apparatus comprising:

a digital computer having at least one storage device;

associated with said digital computer, code containing computer instructions **(col.5, lines 3-6)**

application program associated with said computer; **(col.5, lines 10-14)**

global environment associated with said application program; **(col.5, lines 22-46)**

at least one local document generated by said application program and located within said storage device; and **(col.6, lines 39-60)**

a detection module coupled to said code, said detection module analyzing said code and making the determination that a macro virus is present **(col.12, lines 13-22)** when said code contains instructions causing a macro to be moved to a global environment **(col.8, lines 30-39 and col.9, lines 43-63)** and said code also contains instructions causing the same macro to be copied to a local document. **(col.13, line 34 thru col.14, line 23)**

As per claim 15:

Chen teaches a repair module coupled to the detection module and to the code, said repair module adapted to delete the code when the detection module determines that the code contains a macro virus. **(col.9, line 51 thru col.10, line 3)**

As per claim 16:

Chen teaches a computer readable medium containing a computer program for detecting a macro virus in code adapted for use on a digital computer, said program containing instructions for performing the steps of:

analyzing the code to determine whether said code contains instructions causing a macro to be moved to a global environment; **(col.5, lines 3-14 and col.6, lines 38-60)**

when the code contains instructions causing a macro to be moved to a global environment, flagging said macro; **(col.8, lines 30-39 and col.9, lines 43-63)**

analyzing the code to determine whether said code contains instructions causing the flagged macro to be copied to a local document; and **(col.13, line 34 thru col.14, line 23)**

when the code contains instructions causing the flagged macro to be copied to a local document, declaring that said flagged macro contains a macro virus. **(col.15, line 43 thru col.16, line 9)**

Conclusion


***For more details concerning the cited rejections above, please refer to
Chen, Et Al.: col.4, line 42, ET Seq.***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LEYNNA T. HA whose telephone number is (703) 305-3853. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday (7:00 - 5:00PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, AYAZ SHEIKH can be reached on (703) 305-9648. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-5631.

LHa


AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100